



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,268	10/17/2001	Peter W. Wenzel	14485RRUS01U	6371
49403	7590	12/02/2009	EXAMINER	
GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON P.O. BOX 160727 AUSTIN, TX 78716-0727			DANIEL JR, WILLIE J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2617		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JIVY@TEXASPATENTS.COM  
SMCWHINNIE@TEXASPATENTS.COM  
MMURDOCK@TEXASPATENTS.COM

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/981,268	WENZEL ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	WILLIE J. DANIEL JR	2617

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 13 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 10-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Charles N. Appiah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1. Applicant's arguments filed 13 November 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims for relevant citations and comments in this section and Final Action mailed on 16 September 2009).
2. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding applicant's argument of claim 1 on pg. 11, 1<sup>st</sup> full par., "...do not teach...initial programming or storage of a plurality of home agents in a subscriber prior to an initial registration attempt...", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant has failed to interpret and appreciate the combined teachings of well-known prior art Ton and Perkins that clearly discloses the claimed feature(s) as would be clearly recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art. In particular, Ton discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

initially programming addresses for a plurality of home agents in the subscriber unit prior to an initial registration attempt with a primary home agent (see pgs. 2-3, [0023, 0028]; pg. 5, [0060-0062]), wherein the cellular system/network provides a list of home agents attached to a mobile IP reply message (Mobile IP RRP) through which the subscriber unit may register, and subsequently the subscriber unit stores said list of alternate home agents for redundancy support, and where the subscriber unit can receive an advertisement to be aware of another home agent in addition to the primary home agent that is pre-assigned to the subscriber unit as evidenced by the fact that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize (see pg. 3, [0036, lines 9-12; 0039, lines 3-4]). As further support in the same field of endeavor, Perkins discloses the language as related to the claimed feature(s)

programming addresses for a plurality of home agents in the subscriber unit prior to an initial registration attempt (see pgs. 34-35, section 3.6), where a mobile node (subscriber unit) in a mobile IP communication system can be configured to store IP addresses of one or more home agents (i.e., primary and secondary home agents) for discovering and registration in the system. Therefore, the combination(s) of the reference(s) Ton and Perkins as addressed above more than adequately meets the claim limitations.

3. Regarding applicant's argument(s) of claims 2-7 and 10-21, the claims are addressed for the same reasons as set forth above and as applied in each claim rejection of the Final Action.